Case 1:15-cr-00084-KPF Document 9 Filed 04/13/15 Page 1 of 34 1

FUNIARE	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	x
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
V.	15 CR 84 (KPF)
STEVEN HART,	
Defendant.	PLEA
	х
	New York, N.Y. March 13, 2015 3:05 p.m.
Before:	
HON. KATHERI	NE POLK FAILLA,
	District Judge
APPE	ARANCES
PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
JASON H. COWLEY Assistant United States A	ttorney
JEFFREY T. KERN	-
KEVIN R. PUVALOWSKI Attorneys for Defendant	
necomeys for berendance	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Case called)

THE COURT: Mr. Puvalowski, do you have a copy of the indictment? And if you have it, can you place it in front of your client.

MR. PUVALOWSKI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. COWLEY: Your Honor, just so the record is clear, it's an information.

THE COURT: Information. Excuse me. I knew that's what threw them off. Thank you.

Mr. Hart, I'm going to ask you, please, to bring the microphone as close to you as possible, only because the acoustics in this courtroom are what they are.

Your counsel has placed before you a copy of the information; I believe it was the information on which you were arraigned a few weeks ago.

And I've been told, sir, that it is your intention today to change your plea and to plead guilty to Counts One and Two of this information.

Is that correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Mr. Hart, I'm going to ask you a series of questions. And these questions serve a number of purposes, so let me tell you what some of those purposes are.

I want to make sure, first, that you are competent and

that you understand what's going on today. I want to make sure you are pleading guilty because you are, in fact, guilty of these offenses and not for some other reason.

MR. PUVALOWSKI: Judge, would you prefer if we rise?

THE COURT: No, I want him to be comfortable. If he's more comfortable sitting down, he's welcome to sit down. I appreciate that many times folks stand as a formality, but I care more that he's comfortable. Of course, Mr. Hart, if you're more comfortable standing, you can do that, too.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm fine.

THE COURT: Okay. So again, sir, these questions are designed to make sure that you are pleading guilty because you are, in fact, guilty; that you understand what your rights are, what rights you would be waiving; that you understand what the consequences would be of a guilty plea.

The most important thing today, sir, is that you understand what's going on. So if at any point in these proceedings there's something about my question that doesn't make sense or there's something that you want to ask of your counsel, we'll take whatever breaks you need. So please feel free to do that; let me know if something I'm asking you doesn't make sense or let me know if you need to take a break just to discuss something with your counsel.

All right, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

1	THE COURT: Mr. Lopez, could you please swear in		
2	Mr. Hart.		
3	(Defendant sworn)		
4	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please state your name for the		
5	record.		
6	THE DEFENDANT: Steven Hart.		
7	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.		
8	THE COURT: Mr. Hart, the significance of you being		
9	placed under oath is that if at any point in time you answer		
10	any of my questions falsely, you may be prosecuted for the		
11	separate offense of perjury.		
12	Do you understand that, sir?		
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.		
14	THE COURT: Mr. Hart, how old are you?		
15	THE DEFENDANT: Forty-three.		
16	THE COURT: How far did you go in school, sir?		
17	THE DEFENDANT: I had a postgraduate degree at NYU		
18	Stern.		
19	THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized		
20	for any form of mental illness?		
21	THE DEFENDANT: No.		
22	THE COURT: Have you ever been hospitalized or treated		
23	for any form of addiction, including drug or alcohol addiction?		
24	THE DEFENDANT: No.		
25	THE COURT: Have you taken any drugs, medicine, or		

```
pills in the last two days?
1
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: No.
 3
               THE COURT: Have you consumed any alcoholic beverages
      in the past two days?
 4
 5
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               No.
               THE COURT: Is your mind clear today, sir?
 6
 7
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 8
               THE COURT: Do you understand what is happening?
9
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
10
               THE COURT: Mr. Puvalowski, have you discussed this
     matter with Mr. Hart?
11
               MR. PUVALOWSKI: I have, your Honor.
12
13
               THE COURT: Do you believe that he understands what he
      would be doing, what rights he would be waiving by pleading
14
15
      quilty?
16
               MR. PUVALOWSKI: I do, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Do you have any reason to doubt his
18
      competence to plead guilty?
19
               MR. PUVALOWSKI: No.
20
               THE COURT: Do you believe he's understanding the
21
      nature of these proceedings?
22
               MR. PUVALOWSKI: I do.
23
               THE COURT: Mr. Cowley, do you have any doubt as to
24
     Mr. Hart's competence to plead guilty?
25
```

MR. COWLEY: I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hart, based on your answers of the questions I've just asked you, my observations of your demeanor here in court today, and the discussions I've just had with your counsel and the counsel for the government, I find that you are fully competent to enter a knowing and voluntary plea of quilty.

Now, you have seen the information before you, sir. Have you had enough of an opportunity to discuss with your attorneys the charges to which you intend to plead guilty and any possible defenses that you might have to these charges?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Have your attorneys explained to you the consequences of entering a plea of guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, they have.

THE COURT: And are you satisfied with your attorneys' representations of you in this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Then, Mr. Hart, what I would like to do is turn to the rights that you have and rights that you be waiving by pleading guilty. Once again, sir, the most important thing is that you understand what I am saying; so, again, you'll let me know if you need any sort of break or any sort of clarification.

I'll begin with this: Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you have the right to plead not guilty to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the charges contained in the information.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If you decided to plead not guilty, you would be entitled to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges contained in the information.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: At a trial, you would be presumed to be innocent, and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be found guilty.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: A jury of 12 people would have to find that you were guilty, and you would not have to prove that you were innocent if you were to go to trial.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: At that trial and at every stage of your case, you would be entitled to be represented by counsel. And if at any point in time you were unable to afford an attorney, one would be appointed for you at public expense, that is, free of cost, in order to represent you.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: If there were a trial in this case, the government's witnesses would have to come to court and testify in your presence. And your attorneys could cross-examine the witnesses for the government, they could offer evidence on your behalf, they could challenge the evidence that was offered by the government. You would also have the right to have subpoenas issued or other process used to compel witnesses to testify in your defense.

Just to be clear, sir, you would have no obligation to present any case, but if you wanted to, your attorneys could.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: If there were a trial in this case, you would have the right to testify if you chose to do so, but you would also have the right not to testify if you chose to do so. And if you decided not to testify, no one, including the jury, could draw any inference or suggestion of guilt from the fact that you did not testify.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: Mr. Hart, I want to make sure that you've had an opportunity to discuss with your attorneys whether there is any basis to seek suppression or exclusion of some or all of the government's evidence against you on the grounds that your

constitutional rights may have been violated. Now, again, sir, I'm not saying there were, I just want to make sure you've had a chance to talk to your attorneys about that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: And do you understand, sir, that by entering a guilty plea, one of the things that you do is give up your right to seek suppression or exclusion of the evidence against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: Mr. Hart, if this case were to proceed to trial and if you were to be convicted at a trial, you would have the right to appeal from that verdict.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And even now, sir, as you're entering this guilty plea, you have the right to change your mind and to enter a plea of not guilty, and we can proceed to trial on the charges contained in the information.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If you plead guilty and if I accept your guilty plea, you will give up your right to a trial and the other rights that I've just discussed with you, other than your right to an attorney, because you have that at all stages of your prosecution, whether you plead guilty or go to trial.

If you do plead guilty, however, there will be no trial, and I will sentence you based on the statements that you make today and statements that I receive in the form of sentencing submissions from your attorneys and from the attorney for the government, and from a presentence investigation report that I receive from the United States Probation Office.

Also, sir, if you plead guilty, there will be no appeal on the particular issue of whether or not the government can use the evidence it has against you. And there would also be no appeal on the particular issue of whether you did or did not commit the offenses to which you plead guilty.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: And Mr. Hart, if you plead guilty, there is a degree to which you will have to give up your right not to incriminate yourself. And that is because I need to ask you a series of questions later on in this proceeding that confirms for me that you're pleading guilty because you are, in fact, guilty, and not for some other reason. And in the course of answering those questions, you will have to admit and acknowledge your guilt.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: Mr. Hart, do you understand each of the

1 rights we've been discussing? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Would you like me to provide any 4 additional information about any of them? 5 THE DEFENDANT: No, thank you. 6 THE COURT: And do you wish to continue at this time 7 to give up your right to trial and the other rights that I've been discussing and enter a plea of guilty? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 10 THE COURT: I understand, sir, that you're charged in 11 the two counts of the information to which you're going to 12 plead guilty with obstruction of justice and perjury; is that correct? 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Cowley, could you please state the elements of each of these offenses. 16 17 MR. COWLEY: Yes, your Honor. 18 With regard to Count One, the obstruction of justice 19 count, which is charged in violation of 18 U.S.C., Section 20 1505, your Honor, that crime has three elements: 21 One, that on or about the dates set forth in the 22 information, a proceeding was pending before an agency of the 23 United States, in this case the United States Securities and

Two, that the defendant was aware that a proceeding

24

25

Exchange Commission.

was pending before that agency.

And, three, that the defendant corruptly endeavored to influence, obstruct or impede the due and proper administration of justice of the law under which the proceeding was being conducted.

In regard to Count Two, your Honor, the perjury count, which is charged in violation of 18 U.S.C., Section 1621, that count has four elements, your Honor:

One, that the defendant took an oath to testify truthfully before the SEC, a body authorized by law to administer such oaths.

Two, the defendant made false statements as to matters about which the defendant testified under oath as set forth in the information.

Three, that the matters as to which it is charged that the defendant made false statements were material to the issue under inquiry by the SEC.

And, four, that such false statements were willingly made.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Hart, did you hear the prosecutor speak a moment ago?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you understand that these are the elements that the government would have to prove at a trial

beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, I believe, as well, although

Mr. Cowley will tell me if I'm mistaken, there is also perhaps
a venue requirement to each of these offenses, or is there
none?

MR. COWLEY: There is a venue requirement, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me just momentarily speak about that, sir.

Mr. Hart, what that means is in addition to everything that you've just heard Mr. Cowley say, the government would also have to prove that some portion of these offenses took place in the Southern District of New York, in this district, including Manhattan, the Bronx, Westchester County. That element would have to be proven by a slightly lesser standard of what's called preponderance of the evidence. But those, collectively speaking, are all of the things the government would have to prove if this case were to go to trial.

All right, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Let me then talk to you about the maximum possible penalties that are associated with these offenses.

And I'm using the term "maximum" to refer to the most that could possibly be imposed. I'm not meaning to suggest in this discussion that this is exactly what you're going to receive,

but I do want to make sure that you understand that by pleading guilty, you're subjecting yourself to any combination of punishments up to the statutory maximum.

So do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Let me then talk first about the possible restrictions on your liberty.

The maximum term of imprisonment for each of these offenses is five years, and that could be followed by a term of up to three years of supervised release. And when I use the term "supervised release," I'm sure you've discussed this with your attorneys, but what I'm referring to is a period during which you would be subject to supervision by the United States Probation Office. And during that period, there would be terms and conditions of supervised release.

If you were to violate those terms and conditions of supervised release, the possibility exists that your supervised release term could be revoked, and that you could be sent to jail to serve a period of time without a jury trial. If that were to happen, sir, you would get no credit for any time that you might have spent on this offense, and you would get no credit for any time that you spent on post-release supervision without having any incident.

So have you had a chance to talk to your attorneys about supervised release?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: I also want to make sure you understand, sir, that there's no parole in the federal system. So if you were to be sentenced to a term of imprisonment, you would not be released early on parole. There is credit in the federal system for good behavior, but even were you to receive that credit, you would still have to serve approximately 85 percent of the term of imprisonment.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: In addition to these restrictions on your liberty, the offenses to which you propose to plead guilty also have certain financial penalties. The maximum allowable fine for each offense is \$500,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense, or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than yourself, whichever of these three is the greatest. I can also order restitution to any person or entity injured as a result of your criminal conduct.

Now, do the parties believe forfeiture is not appropriate here on these offenses?

MR. COWLEY: That's correct, your Honor, there is no forfeiture for these offenses.

THE COURT: Then I will not bother discussing forfeiture with you, sir. But I must order a mandatory special assessment of \$100 per count. So in this case it would be

1 \$200. That's a mandatory special assessment, meaning I can't 2 not impose it. 3 Do you understand that these, sir, are the maximum 4 possible penalties to which you are exposed with a guilty plea? 5 THE DEFENDANT: One second, please. 6 THE COURT: Of course. 7 (Pause) 8 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. 9 THE COURT: I also want to make sure you understand, 10 sir, again, just because we are talking about maximum possible 11 terms, that the maximum total term of imprisonment, if you 12 stack those two counts together, is ten years imprisonment. 13 Do you understand that, sir? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 15 THE COURT: Are you a United States citizen, Mr. Hart? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: I ask you that, sir, because some of the 18 folks who appear before me are not, and in those cases, a 19 quilty plea can have adverse immigration consequences. 20 doesn't apply to you. 21 This other question also may not apply to you, but I 22 am obligated to ask it: Are you serving any other sentence, 23 state or federal, anywhere, for any offense? 24 THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm not.

THE COURT: And to the best of your knowledge, sir,

25

are you being prosecuted in any other jurisdiction?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm not.

THE COURT: Again, sir, I have defendants who appear before me who are, and in that case I have to talk to them about how the resolution of this case impacts that case.

I mentioned you are a citizen, sir, so you don't have adverse immigration consequences, but there is this: It is possible that as a result of your guilty plea, you may lose certain civil rights, to the extent you have them today, or to the extent that you might otherwise obtain them in the future. These would include the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury, and the right to possess a firearm.

Are you aware of that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you had a chance to talk to your attorneys about the United States Sentencing Guidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And just briefly speaking, they are something that I must consider in connection with any sentencing that I do. I mention them to you, sir, because I want to make sure that you understand that to the extent that your attorneys or the government or anyone has attempted to predict the sentence that you will ultimately receive, their predictions could be wrong. I am the person who will be

sentencing you, and I will not be able to do that until I hear from you today about your guilty plea, until I receive the presentence investigation report that I've told you about that the probation office will prepare, and until I receive the sentencing submissions from the parties. And after that, I myself need to look at the guidelines, and I also need to look at various sentencing factors that I know you've discussed with your counsel that are set forth in Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code.

So, sir, let me ask you this question first:

Have you had a chance to talk to your attorneys about the process of sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: And do you also understand the things that happen that I have to do prior to sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Even if the sentence that you ultimately receive is different from what anyone might have told you it is, and even if it's different from what you expect or hope for, you will still be bound by your guilty plea; you will not be able to withdraw your plea of guilty to these counts.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I've been told that there is a written plea agreement between you and your attorneys and counsel for

1 the government. I've been given a document. The document I have is dated March 6th of this year. 2 3 Now, do you have a copy of a similar document in front 4 If not, I will hand you my copy. of you? 5 MR. COWLEY: I can grab that, your Honor, with the 6 Court's permission. That's the original, your Honor. I have 7 another copy here for you if you'd like. 8 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 9 MR. COWLEY: The original has the defendant's 10 signature on it; that copy does not. 11 THE COURT: That's okay. 12 THE DEPUTY CLERK: He has a copy, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. Then I now have two. That is 14 Thank you, Mr. Cowley. fine. 15 All right. Mr. Hart, the copy that I have I have marked as Court Exhibit 2, because I think the last time we 16 17 were together there was a waiver of indictment form that I had marked as Court Exhibit 1. 18

So the document that I have, sir, is six pages long. Is that the same length as the document before you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Could you turn, please, to the sixth page.

All right. You're there now, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: On this page, at least on my version,

```
there are several signatures. Are there signatures on the
1
 2
      version that you have, as well?
 3
               MR. PUVALOWSKI: Your Honor, the version that's in
 4
      front of the defendant has the signatures from the government.
 5
      Ours are blank. But I think if you ask the defendant, he will
6
      confirm that he did, in fact, sign the version that's in your
 7
     hand.
8
               THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Hart, are you able to see the
9
      last page of this document, or would you like me to hand it
10
     back to you?
11
               THE DEFENDANT: I can see it.
12
               THE COURT: There are two signatures. Is one of them
13
      yours?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
15
               THE COURT: Did you sign this today, sir?
16
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
17
               THE COURT: Did you read this document before you
18
      signed it?
               THE DEFENDANT: I did.
19
20
               THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney
21
     before you signed it?
22
               THE DEFENDANT: I did.
23
               THE COURT: Did you fully understand the document
     before you signed it?
24
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
```

THE COURT: One of the features of this document, and it's on page 2, is that the parties have stipulated to the application of the United States guidelines to your case.

I wanted to make sure you understand, sir, that that stipulation is binding on you and your attorneys, it's binding on the government, it is not binding on me, because I'm not a signatory to the agreement. This does not mean, sir, that when I calculate my own guidelines calculation that I will come out with something different, but I did want to make sure you understand that I have an independent obligation to calculate the guidelines.

So do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: There are also a couple of provisions I would like to go over with you.

Sticking with this page 2, if you look at the first full paragraph, sir, I understand this to be an agreement by you to make restitution in an amount ordered by the Court at some later date. Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And then also turning, please, to page 4 of the agreement, and I'm looking particularly at the third full paragraph that begins "It is agreed."

Do you see that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: What I understand this to be, sir, is a series of waivers that you and the government have each entered into, so you want to make sure I understand them. What I understand this to say is that you are waiving your right to appeal or otherwise challenge any sentence that is 18 months of imprisonment or below. So if I were to sentence you to a term of 18 months of imprisonment or anything less than that, that you would be waiving your right to appeal or otherwise challenge that component of your sentence.

Is that correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Also in this paragraph, I understand that you are agreeing not to appeal or challenge any term of supervised release that is less than or equal to the statutory maximum that I mentioned earlier. So, again, if I were to impose a term of supervised release at the statutory maximum or anything less than that, you are waiving your right to appeal that portion of your sentence.

Is that correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And then further on, I see that you are agreeing not to appeal any fine that is less than or equal to \$30,000. So were I to impose a fine of \$30,000 or something less than that, you are waiving your right to appeal that component of your sentence.

1 Again, is that correct, sir? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is. 3 THE COURT: Does this written plea agreement that 4 we've just been discussing constitute your complete and total 5 understanding of the entire agreement you have with the 6 government? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Has anything been left out, sir? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: No. 10 THE COURT: Other than what is in this agreement, has 11 anyone made any promise to you or offered you any inducement 12 either to get you to sign this agreement or to get you to plead 13 quilty here today? 14 THE DEFENDANT: No. 15 THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you or forced you either to sign this agreement or to plead quilty here today? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: No. 18 THE COURT: Has anyone made any promise to you as to what your ultimate sentence will be? 19 20 THE DEFENDANT: No. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Hart, please tell me in your own words 22 what you did that makes you believe that you are guilty of the 23 offenses charged in Count One and Count Two. 24 And I'll stop you for a moment, sir. I believe you 25 have a written document in front of you. Are these your words,

sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, they are.

THE COURT: All right. And do you have this in front of you to sort of aid you in recalling what it is you wish to say?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Please continue.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I did, in fact, engage in acts to obstruct a pending SEC investigation during the time period alleged in the information. And I did offer sworn testimony to the SEC on August 19th, 2009 that was not truthful.

From 2006 to 2011, I worked for a small investment firm in Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. In July of 2009, I learned that the SEC was investigating my securities trading activity, including whether I was conducting improper match trades between a fund managed by my employer and a fund I beneficially owned called Octagon Capital Partners, whether I was trading on material nonpublic information in connection with several pikes offerings.

As part of its investigation, the SEC in Manhattan,

New York sent subpoenas to me personally and also to the firm

where I worked. The owner was away when the SEC subpoena

reached the firm. I opened it and decided to respond to it

myself without telling the owner or any coworkers about it. I

did not want the owner to know about my trading or that I was under investigation by the SEC, because I was fearful that I would lose my job.

In sending documents to the SEC in response to the subpoena sent to my employer, I did not disclose to the SEC that I was the only one at the company that was aware of the subpoena. This was a poor decision. I took a bad situation and made it worse.

Later, on August 19th, 2009, I sat for sworn testimony before the SEC, in the SEC's office here in Manhattan. During that sworn testimony, I also told several lies. Specifically, I was asked about match trading conduct, that is, whether I caused a fund managed by my employer to purchase securities from Octagon Capital Partners at employee prices.

While I testified accurately that I caused trades to take place between the firm that employed me and Octagon in responding to questions from SEC's attorneys, I falsely stated that the owner of the firm I worked for and I discussed and agreed to carry out these trades as deliberate strategy for the fund managed by my employer, and that we did not believe there was any problem with the trading. In fact, I never disclosed or discussed any of this trading with the owner of the firm.

I also falsely stated during my sworn testimony that I spoke with the owner of the firm I worked for about the SEC's investigation into my trading activity, when, in reality, I

never discussed the SEC's investigation with my employer. As I said earlier, I did not want the owner to find out about the SEC investigation or my improper trading out of fear that I would lose my job.

I know that the things I lied about were important to the SEC's investigation and into my trading. Prior to testifying, I had taken an oath to tell the truth and understood I was under an obligation to provide accurate testimony. When I did not do so, I knew it was wrong and I knew it was unlawful.

Later, on or about December 8, 2009, one of the SEC attorneys assigned to the investigation called our office, and I answered the phone. The attorney requested a call from the firm owner, but I did not relay this message. The next day, the same SEC attorney called back, and again asked for the owner. This time I pretended to be the owner, my employer, and in summary said that I was aware of Steven Hart's improper trading, but still wanted to retain him as an employee. I also falsely stated that I was aware of the match trades and approved of it as a means of disposing of restricted stock.

Two days later, during another call with SEC attorneys, I again impersonated the owner and made several more false statements along the same lines as the previous call in which I impersonated my employer.

Your Honor, in pretending to be the firm's owner, I

obviously did not stop to think how ill-advised this decision was. Again, I took a bad decision and made it worse.

In conclusion, my conduct that I described to you today was wrong, unlawful, and intentional. I acknowledge that the conduct impeded the SEC's investigation.

Please note that I am sorry for what I did, and I am prepared to accept responsibility for my actions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Puvalowski, do you know of any valid defense that would prevail at trial or any other reason why your client should not be permitted to plead guilty?

MR. PUVALOWSKI: I do not.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Cowley, are there any additional questions that you would like me to ask?

MR. COWLEY: No additional questions, your Honor, but there are a few additional facts that I would like to put on the record.

One is that, in fact, an official proceeding, that is, an investigation, was opened by the SEC and was taking place between July and December of 2009; that the SEC is, in fact, authorized by law to administer oaths when doing things like taking testimony of witnesses like Mr. Hart. And then one other fact to add is that the SEC attorneys that were making the calls referenced by Mr. Hart in December of 2009 were

located in the SEC's offices in Manhattan, New York.

Additionally, your Honor, one other thing I'd like to put on the record is that in May of 2014, a tolling agreement was entered into between the parties; and that pursuant to that agreement, the period beginning on May 23rd, 2014 and running through and including May 22nd, 2015, was tolled and excluded from any calculation of time for purposes of adjudicating any claim based on either the statute of limitations under the laws of the United States or any constitutional statutory or other doctrine concerning pre-indictment delay.

So I just wanted to put that on the record.

THE COURT: Before you sit down, Mr. Puvalowski, you don't dispute or challenge anything that Mr. Cowley has said; is that correct?

MR. PUVALOWSKI: I do not. That's correct.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Cowley, could you please summarize what the government's evidence would be if this case were to proceed to trial.

MR. COWLEY: Yes, your Honor.

The government's evidence would consist of the deposition testimony of Mr. Hart from the original deposition that took place in August of 2009. It would also consist of the contents of an additional deposition that Mr. Hart sat for later, I believe a few years later, where he acknowledged under

oath that he was, in fact, the person impersonating his 1 employer, and that he testified falsely in his previous 2 3 depositions. The evidence would also consist of testimony from 4 SEC staff attorneys that were present at the original 5 deposition and participated in phone calls with Mr. Hart in 6 December of 2009, thinking at the time that they were 7 interacting with others. THE COURT: Thank you. 8 9 Mr. Hart, were you able to hear Mr. Cowley? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 11 THE COURT: And do you understand, sir, that if this 12 case were to go to trial, that is the evidence the government 13 would present? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Puvalowski, do you agree that there's a sufficient factual predicate for a guilty plea? 16 17 MR. PUVALOWSKI: I do, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Is there any reason why I should not 19 accept this guilty plea? 20 MR. PUVALOWSKI: No, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Cowley, do you agree there's a 22 sufficient factual predicate for the guilty plea? 23 MR. COWLEY: I do, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Is there any reason why I shouldn't accept 25 it?

MR. COWLEY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hart, I will ask this question just because it is appropriate: Do you wish to continue, sir, to enter a plea of guilty to Counts One and Two of the information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Because you've acknowledged that you are, in fact, guilty of these two offenses, because I'm satisfied that you know of your rights, including your right to enter a plea of not guilty and go to trial, because I'm satisfied that you're aware of the consequences of your guilty plea, including the range of sentences that may be imposed, and because I find that you are knowingly and voluntarily pleading guilty, I will accept your guilty plea to Counts One and Two of the information.

Now, the next stage, sir, is sentencing. And I talked about it a little bit earlier, because I mentioned that the probation office will want to speak to you in connection with sentencing in order to prepare a presentence investigation report.

Mr. Puvalowski, do you wish to be present for any interview?

MR. PUVALOWSKI: We do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then I will order that there be no interview, unless you or your colleague, Mr. Kern, is present.

Mr. Hart, let me offer you the following thought and you can do with it what you will:

If and to the extent that you speak with the probation office, I would ask you to be sure that everything you say to them is as truthful and as accurate as you can make it. I say this, sir, because in trying to figure out how to sentence someone and to what to sentence someone, the presentence investigation report is very, very important to me. I read it very carefully, and I tend to ask a fair number of questions about it. So it helps me the most if the document is as accurate as it can be.

I will let you know and your attorneys will let you know that you have an opportunity to see the report before I do. And you have the opportunity to make corrections and offer corrections to the probation office if there are errors in the report. You also have the opportunity to object if there's something in the report that you think is objectionable. So, again, I invite you -- I don't tell you you have to, but I invite you to make use of those opportunities, because the most complete presentence report is the most helpful thing for me.

Do you understand, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Lopez, may we have a sentencing date.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, your Honor.

1 Tuesday, June 23rd at 3 p.m. THE COURT: Does that work for the parties? 2 3 MR. COWLEY: It does for the government, your Honor. 4 (Pause) MR. PUVALOWSKI: Your Honor, I apologize for the 5 6 delay. 7 THE COURT: No, no. Whatever time you need. 8 (Pause) 9 MR. PUVALOWSKI: Would it be possible -- we're trying 10 to deal with a school schedule issue. Would it be possible 11 perhaps one week later? That's the final week of school, and 12 one week later would be appreciated. 13 THE COURT: Okay. I'm sure we can find time. 14 So the week of the 30th of June. 15 MR. PUVALOWSKI: Yes. THE COURT: School will be over by then? 16 17 MR. PUVALOWSKI: School will be over by then. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Lopez, something that week. 19 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, your Honor. 20 Thursday, July 2nd at 3 p.m. 21 MR. PUVALOWSKI: Thank you very much, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Sure. 23 Mr. Cowley, does that work for you, sir? 24 MR. COWLEY: It does, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Okay.

Let me just remind counsel or let counsel know in the first instance that I have individual rules of practice for criminal cases. The important thing to know is simply that I'd like the defense sentencing submission two weeks in advance of sentencing, and the government's sentencing submission one week in advance of sentencing so I can have a chance to look at it.

Mr. Cowley, any objection to continuing Mr. Hart on the current bail conditions?

MR. COWLEY: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Hart, then let me just advise you, sir, you need to be here for the sentencing. I know you know that, sir, but I need to tell you that nonetheless. Only bad things can happen for you if you fail to appear for sentencing. There is a separate offense of bail jumping, and I'm sure that's not something you're interested in pursuing. So we will leave you out on bail on the conditions we set at our last proceeding. And it is my every expectation you will be here on the 2nd; is that correct, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Cowley, is there anything else that we should be talking about in this proceeding?

MR. COWLEY: Not from the government, your Honor.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Puvalowski, anything else? 1 2 MR. PUVALOWSKI: Nothing else, your Honor. Thank you. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Hart, I should have asked earlier, is there a member of your family who's here to support you today, 4 5 sir? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. It is my wife, Betsy Hart. 7 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Hart, I do want to welcome you. I know these are 8 9 never fun proceedings; no one has fun at a criminal conference. 10 But it is critically important to the defendants that I see 11 that their family members are there to support them. sure Mr. Hart is incredibly appreciative of the fact that you 12 13 are supporting him through this. And I am thankful to you for 14 coming today. So thank you very much. And I would have noted 15 you earlier, I just wasn't sure whether you were here with him. 16 So thank you for coming today. 17 MS. HART: My pleasure. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We're done. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25